President.—It may be taken up to-day.

Mr. K. P. Kannan Nayar.—I move that the Bill be taken up into consideration.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—I second it.

Motion put and carried.

President.—Whereas it is expedient further to amend the Cochin Municipal Regulation, XI of 1096, hereinafter referred to as the said Regulation, it is hereby enacted as follows:—

Preamble.

Pnamble put and carried.

1. This Regulation may be called "The Cochin Municipal (Amendment) Regulation of 110 .

Short title.

Section put and carried.

2. In section 53 (1) of the said Regulation for the words "two rupees" occurring between the words "exceed" and "per cart" substitute the words "two rupees, eight annas."

Amendment of section 53 (1).

Section put and carried.

3. In Schedule III of the said Regulatio for the figures against the entries "For every two wheeled vehicle constructed to be drawn by one or more animals" and "For every rikshaw" substitute the figures "3-8-0" and Rs. "1-12-0' respectively.

Amendment of Schedule III,

Section put and carried.

Mr. K. P. Kannan Nayar.—I move that the Bill be taken up and passed to-morrow.

Mr. C. J. Mathew.—I second it.

Motion put and carried.

Resolutions on matters of General Public Interest.

(1) Second crop Assessment—(*contd*).

മിസ്റ്റർ ടി. എ. രാമചന്ദ്രയ്യർ.—ഈ രണ്ടാം വിളവു നികുതി പിരിയ്ക്കുന്നതിനെപ്പറ്റിയുള്ള ആക്ഷേപങ്ങളെല്ലാം ഈ പ്രമേയം കൊണ്ടുവന്ന മെമ്പർതന്നെ വിശദമായി ഇവിടെ പറഞ്ഞുകഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടുണ്ട്. ആ സ്ഥിതിയ്ക്ക് അതിനെക്കാൾ കൂടുതലായി ഇതിനെപ്പറ്റി എനിയ്ക്ക് വളരെയൊന്നും പറയുവാനില്ല. സാല്പം വിലയുമാത്രമെ പറയുവാനുള്ളൂ.

രണ്ടാംവിളവുനികുതി പിരിയ്ക്കുക എന്നുള്ളതു തന്നെ അനീതിയായിട്ടുള്ളതാണെന്നാണ് എനിയ്ക്ക് അഭിപ്രായം. പറയുവാനുള്ളതു്. എന്തുകൊണ്ടെന്നുവെച്ചാൽ ഇക്കഴിഞ്ഞ സെറ്റിൽമെൻറുകാലത്തു് ഈ ഭൂമികളെ എല്ലാം ഒരു വിളവെടുക്കുന്ന ഭൂമികൾ ഇന്നതെന്നും രണ്ടു വിളവെടുക്കുന്ന ഭൂമികൾ ഇന്നതെന്നും തീർച്ചയാക്കിയിരുന്നു. അതായതു് വിരിപ്പുഭൂമി ഇന്നതു്, മുണ്ടകൻ കൃഷിചെയ്യുന്ന ഭൂമി ഇന്നതു്എന്നു തീർച്ചയാക്കിയിരുന്നു. എന്നാൽ ഇപ്പോൾ

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ആ വിരിപ്പു ഭൂമികളിൽ മുണ്ടകൻ കൃഷി ഇറക്കീട്ടുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ അതിൽനിന്നും രണ്ടാം വിളവു നികുതി പിരിയ്ക്കാറുണ്ട്. മേല്പറഞ്ഞ വിരിപ്പു ഭൂമികളിൽ വിരിപ്പുകൃഷി ഇറക്കീട്ടുണ്ടോ അതിൽനിന്നും തക്കതായ വിളവു കിട്ടീട്ടുണ്ടോ എന്നൊന്നും അന്വേഷിയ്ക്കാറില്ല. വിരിപ്പോ, മുണ്ടകനൊ രണ്ടാംകൃഷി ഇറക്കീട്ടുണ്ടെന്നുകണ്ടാൽ അതിൽനിന്നും ആ രണ്ടാം വിളവു നികുതി കൂടി പിരിയ്ക്കുന്നുണ്ട്. ആദ്യം വിളവെടുത്തിട്ട് നികുതി കൊടുത്ത നിലത്തിൽ അതിന്റെ ആദായം ശരിയായിട്ടു കിട്ടാതെ, രണ്ടാമതൊരു വിളവുകൂടി എടുത്തു് നഷ്ടംതീർക്കാമെന്നു വിചാരിയ്ക്കുമ്പോൾ അതിനു് രണ്ടാമതും ഒരു നികുതികൂടി പിരിച്ചുവരുന്നു. ഇതു് അനീതിയായിട്ടുള്ളതാണെന്നാണു് എനിയ്ക്ക് പറയുവാനുള്ളതു്.

ആദ്യം നികുതി കൊടുത്തതിന്റെശേഷം പിന്നീടു് ആസ്ഥലത്തു് രണ്ടാമതൊരു കൃഷിയിറക്കുന്നതിന്റെ ഉദ്ദേശംതന്നെ ആ ഭൂമിയിൽനിന്നും ആദ്യംകൊടുത്ത നികുതിയിൽ പിരിയാതെ കിടക്കുന്ന ആദായത്തിന്റെ ഒരുവീതം എടുക്കുന്നതിനുവേണ്ടി മാത്രമാണു്. വാസ്തവത്തിൽ ഒരുപൂവ്വു് വിളയുന്ന ഭൂമിയിൽ രണ്ടാം വിളവുകൂടി ഇറക്കിയില്ലെങ്കിൽ അയാൾക്കുള്ള ആദായം നഷ്ടമാണെന്നു ഇതിൽനിന്നും തെളിയുന്നുണ്ട്. ഒരുപൂവ്വു് വിളവുതന്നെ ഇറക്കുന്നതു് വളരെ പണച്ചിലവും കഷ്ടപ്പാടും ഉള്ളതാണു്. അങ്ങിനെയിരിയ്ക്കേ രണ്ടാമതും ഈ കഷ്ടപ്പാടെല്ലാം സഹിച്ചു് ഒരു പൂവ്വു് വിളവുകൂടി ഇറക്കുന്നതുകൊണ്ടു് ആദ്യത്തെ പൂവ്വിൽ ശരിയായ ആദായം കിട്ടാത്തതുകൊണ്ടാണെന്നു് വിചാരിയ്ക്കണം. അല്ലാതെ ആദ്യത്തെ നഷ്ടവും, പിന്നെ രണ്ടാമത്തെ കൃഷിയിൽ ഒരു നികുതിയുംകൂടിവെച്ചു് അവരെ കഷ്ടപ്പെടുത്തുവാൻ വിചാരിയ്ക്കുന്നതു് അവർക്ക് അതൊരു രക്ഷയാണൊ എന്നുകൂടി നോക്കേണ്ടിയിരിയ്ക്കുന്നു. ആദ്യത്തെ വിളവു മതിയാകാതെ അതിൽ കൂടുതൽതുക നഷ്ടപ്പെട്ടതുകൊണ്ടാണ രണ്ടാമത്തെ വിളവെടുക്കുന്നതു്. അങ്ങിനെ രണ്ടാമത്തെ വിളവിൽകിട്ടുന്ന ആദായം എത്രയാണെന്നു നോക്കിയാൽതന്നെയും, അതിൽനിന്നും അത്രവളരെയൊന്നും ആദായം കിട്ടുന്നില്ലെന്നു ബോദ്ധ്യമാകും.

എന്നാൽ ആദ്യം വിളവെടുത്ത ഭൂമിയിൽ പിന്നെ രണ്ടാം വിളവു എന്തിനാണിറക്കുന്നതെന്നുചോദിച്ചാൽ അതിനു മറ്റൊരു കാരണവുംകൂടി പറയാനുണ്ട്. അതായതു് അവനവൻ ദിവസേന മറ്റൊരുത്തന്റെ കീഴിൽ വേലചെയ്താൽ കിട്ടുന്നകൂലി ർ ണ.യാണ്. ആ കൂലിയ്ക്കുവേണ്ടി കൈവശം ഭൂമിയുള്ളപ്പോൾ അന്യനെ ആശ്രയിക്കാതെ ആ ഭൂമിയിൽനിന്നുംതന്നെ എടുക്കുവാൻ സാധിയ്ക്കുമെന്നുള്ളതുകൊണ്ടാണ് രണ്ടാമതൊരു വിളവുകൂടി എടുക്കുന്നതു്. അതുകൊണ്ടു സാധാരണയായി ആളകം അവനവന്റെ കൂലി കിട്ടുന്നതിനുവേണ്ടി മാത്രം വേലചെയ്യുന്നകാര്യ്

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ത്തിൽ ഗവമ്മെണ്ട് ഒരു നികുതികൂടി പിരിയ്ക്കുന്നതു് വളരെ അനീതിയായിട്ടുള്ളതാണെന്നാണ് എനിയ്ക്ക് പറയുവാനുള്ളതു്.

പിന്നെ ഗവമ്മെന്റിൽനിന്നും ഇതിലേയ്ക്ക് സൌകര്യമായ വിധത്തിൽ തോടൊ, പാലൊ, കുളമൊ മറൊ ഉണ്ടാക്കിക്കൊടുത്തിട്ടാണു് ഈ ഒരു വിളവെടുക്കുന്ന ഭൂമിയിൽ രണ്ടാം വിളവെടുക്കുമ്പോൾ അതിന്റെ നികുതിയും കൂടി പിരിയ്ക്കുന്നതെന്നുവരികിൽ അതു് ന്യായമാണെന്നു പറയാം. അങ്ങിനെ ഒന്നും ചെയ്യാതെ ഇപ്രകാരം കടിയാനവർത്തന്നെ കഷ്ടപ്പെട്ടുവേലചെയ്തു് ഉപജീവനം കഴിയ്ക്കുവാൻ വിചാരിയ്ക്കുന്ന കായ്ത്തിൽ ഗവമ്മെൻറു് ഒരു നികുതികൂടി പിരിയ്ക്കുന്നതു് തീരെ ശരിയല്ല.

എന്നാൽ ഇതു് ഏകദേശം ഫ ഒ കൊല്ലത്തോളമായി നടപ്പിലിരിയ്ക്കുന്ന ഒരു കായ്മയായതുകൊണ്ടു് അതിനെ ഇപ്പോൾ അതുപെട്ടെന്നു നിറുത്താൻ പാടില്ല എന്നാണ് റെവന്യൂമെമ്പർ ഇവിടെ പറഞ്ഞതു്. ഫ ഒ കൊല്ലമായാലും, ഫ ഠ ഒ കൊല്ലമായാലും ഒരു കായ്മം എപ്പോൾ അനീതിയായിട്ടുള്ളതാണെന്നു് ബോദ്ധ്യപ്പെടുന്നുവൊ അന്നു് അതു് നിറുത്തൽ ചെയ്യണമെന്നാണ് എനിയ്ക്ക് പറയുവാനുള്ളതു. ഇതുയും പറഞ്ഞുകൊണ്ടു് ഞാൻ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ പിൻതാങ്ങുന്നു.

Mr. P. Krishna Menon.—I also beg leave to support the resolution. The cogent arguments have almost all been exhausted by my Hon'ble friend Mr. Pettah yesterday so much so that even the leader of the House did confess that he has made out a case in support of the motion that he has brought. But the Hon'ble Leader of the House seems to find an objection for giving effect to the resolution under section 10 of the Settlement Proclamation: I really fail to see how that will be an objection; how that can be treated to meet the necessity of the case. We find that the Proclamation provides for an annual assessment as well. It was only yesterday that in answering question No. 571 it was stated "18 petitions were rejected as they did not come within the purview of the D. P. published in the Cochin Government Gazette and 5 were dismissed as the prices of agricultural product were not lower than those prevailing at the time of settlement. Those petitions which were granted were remission of land tax. If by a D. P. remission of land tax can be effected what is there to prevent the Government by a Proceedings giving remission of the assessment on the second crop also? There is no legal objection is clear from the fact that even land tax has been remitted. Similarly if there are sufficient reasons why should not the same procedure be adopted and relief given? As to the necessity for the relief and the reasons which prompted the Hon'ble Member in moving the resolution, I do not think

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

that there is any one who will say that the arguments advanced are either unjust or unsatisfactory. My authority is the leader of the House himself who has admitted that he has made out a case. If as a matter of fact we find that some injustice is being done or some inconvenience is being felt, what rule is there to prevent the Government from granting the relief that is asked for? For my own part I do not think that section 10 of the Proclamation will stand in the way of the Government in granting a remission at least of the second crop assessment, as they now stand. If the 27 years practice will alone justify the continuation of this for another two years also what guarantee is there that there will be a fresh settlement after the completion of the 30 years? All that has been promised is that there would be no settlement for 30 years. It is not said that there will be a settlement after 30 years. It may take another 30 years. If the Government think that it is inconvenient or inequitable to effect a fresh settlement after the lapse of the 30 years, certainly no Government will venture to revise the settlement or to introduce a fresh settlement. Therefore the only reason that is advanced by the Hon'ble Leader of the House against the grant of the prayer made in the resolution, I submit, can hardly stand. In these circumstances I strongly support the resolution.

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—I explained in extenso all the arguments advanced by the mover of the resolution in support of the motion. I am afraid that there is a great deal of misunderstanding on the part of some of the Hon'ble Members, and from the speech that I heard just now from the Hon'ble Member for Vadakkancheri I think he has misunderstood me. The Hon'ble Member for Vadakkancheri seems to think that just as in a few cases the Government have granted remission, when there is a wide spread calamity like the floods, for second crop no remission is given. As a matter of fact ever since the system was brought into force remission used to be given for the last 27 years so far as occasional double crop charge is concerned. There is also another point which is not quite correct as was brought forward by the same Member. He said:—"The viruppu crop is raised and when that crop fails a second crop is raised and assessment levied." This is absolutely incorrect. The Standing Orders of the Department and Government have laid down that it is only when two crops have been successfully raised that an occasional charge as second crop assessment is levied. When the viruppu fails and a second crop is raised successfully assessment is charged for it. That impression is erroneous and wrong. There is a number of columns in Village account No. IV where the particulars of the

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

second crop are noted. Notices are issued to all villagers concerned and they are asked to show cause whether there is any objection to charge an occasional second crop assessment. The Tahsildars enquire into them if there are objections and they recommend whether remission should be granted or not. I may assure this House that it is only when two crops are successfully raised and also harvested that this occasional second crop charge is charged and all these years whenever there have been floods etc. we have been working these rules very sympathetically. And I have in my scheme for remission, in connection with the last floods, promised to work out the rule with regard to the second crop assessment as sympathetically as possible and I think I said that by doing so there will be a reduction of Rs. 2,500 in the amount that we budgetted for occasional second crop charges. Therefore if there is any impression in the minds of Hon'ble Members, as I see from some of the speeches, that in the case of lands where viruppuhas been raised and it has failed and a second crop is raised, Government insist in charging and collecting second crop assessment—that impression is erroneous.

The resolution is not that second crop assessment should be remitted but that the system itself should be abolished Government only objected to the wholesale abolition. The resolution reads thus "that this council recommends to the Government that the system of occassional second crop assessment now prevailing in the State be abolished." It is not that any remission is not granted or anything like that. We are granting remissions, and if it were that we would certainly have wholeheartedly accepted the motion. But what is aimed at here is that the system itself should be abolished. That system cannot be abolished by a stroke of the pen. That system is one among a hundred things that constitute the Land Revenue Settlement and the Settlement Proclamation which is to be in force for 30 years embodies all these minor details of the settlement scheme. This is only one among them. This has been working for the last 27 years. We cannot take it up piecemeal and amend it alone. The provision is made in the Settlement Proclamation which embodies all the principles of the existing 'Cochin Land Revenue Settlement. This system is based on one of these principles. It is to the abolition of that system that I take objection and Government cannot accept it. Whether 3 years hence the system of second crop assessment is to be revised or is to be enhanced or is to be abolished is a thing to be done after the expiry of the period of settlement. This question also may be brought forward then. Two years ago when a similar resolution

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

was moved I said that it would be noted for consideration and one resolution was withdrawn by the mover and another was rejected then. At present we cannot take up the general principle of the Land Revenue Settlement embodied in the Proclamation piecemeal and do away with that for the next two or three years. All these things will have to be discussed and settled at the time of resettlement and a fair scheme laid down. This is not the stage to consider individual requirements piecemeal. It is to the resolution that wanted to do away with the system altogether that I take objection. We are working the rules very sympathetically and we have been giving remissions. For the last 20 years there have been no serious complaints that the system has not been working. The system has been working for a long time and so far there has been no general outcry. It is to the abolition of the system altogether that we take objection.

Mr. A. Eachara Menon.—The Leader of the House has been saying that when the first crop fails and a second crop is raised the agriculturist is not liable to a second crop assessment. Does the Revenue Member receive any statement of the viruppu lands before a second crop is raised?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—It is the ordinary Land Revenue procedure. We have got a good system of village accounts. There is an account called village account No. IV. We note down all the Survey Nos. registered single crop in the Settlement Register and we have got columns to note down the different Survey Nos. and the extent cultivated both first crop and second crop. There is the provision also that the Revenue Inspector should check the registers as also the Tahsildar when he visits a village. They should each of them initial the register after inspection. There is a separate set of columns for noting the second crop. There also we note the extent of viruppu lands harvested and the extent in which the crop has failed etc. Then they prepare an abstract of account No. 4 for ench viruppu. Wherever two crops have been shown to have succeeded the Survey No. and the extent are noted and there, we have got appendix 4 (a):—

താഴെ പറയുന്ന നമ്പരുകളിൽ രണ്ടു വിളവുകൾ ഇറക്കിട്ടുള്ളതായി അറിയുന്നതിനാൽ അതിനെ ഇതുമാണ്ടത്തെ സെറ്റിൽമെണ്ടു് ഇതും വകുപ്പു് അല്ലെങ്കിൽ ഫ-ാം വകുപ്പുംപ്രകാരം അതിലേയ്ക്കു് നികുതി ചുമത്തുന്നതാകുന്നു. അതിനെപ്പറ്റി നിങ്ങൾക്കു വല്ലതും ആക്ഷേപം പറയുവാനുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ അതു് നമ്മു

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

ടെ മുമ്പാകെ ഇതാംതിയ്യതി ഇത്ര മണി സമയത്തു വന്നു വിവരം ബോധിപ്പിക്കേണ്ടതാകുന്നു.

എന്നു് തഹസിൽദാർ (ഒപ്പു്).

എന്നു പറഞ്ഞു നോട്ടീസ്സു കൊടുക്കുന്നുണ്ടു്.

With these things I am more acquainted than others. We charge only when two crops are successfully harvested. You may take it on my word of honour. We have also heard no complaints.

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—On a point of information. Suppose in a field the first crop is not raised and only the second crop is raised. What is the rate charged ?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—It is the full rate, not half rate.

Mr. K. G. Nayar.—What is roughly the amount collected by virtue of this assessment ?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—Originally, I believe it was Rs. 25,000, twenty seven years ago. Last year it has dwindled down to Rs. 7,500. Every year it has been decreasing, owing to prayers of composition.

Mr Joseph Pettah.—On a point of information. The first crop assessment is collected even before the second crop is raised.

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—No, No. It is not. The first crop charge is collected in the months of Thulam, Vrischigam and Dhanu. Viruppu is raised in Medam and Mundakan is raised in the month of Kanni. There is regular inspection by the Tahsildar.

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—The first crop charge is collected without reference to the second crop ?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—There is nothing known as first crop. It is the permanent crop. There is only the permanent charge. In Viruppu lands Puncha is cultivated. In Puncha lands Mundakan is cultivated. According to the Settlement it may be Viruppu, it may be Mundakan or it may be Viruppu-Mundakkan or it may be Puncha-Mundakan. It is only in addition to that permanent assessment that the second crop is charged. If one or two Hon'ble Members would accompany me to a village office, I will gladly show them all these things and explain to them how the thing is done.

Mr. E. Ikkanda Warriar.—May I know whether the dwindling is due to the usual remission given ?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—A great deal of composition. There have been remissions in the years of drought. This year there is a remission. Some years ago, in the Nemmara Firkah the occasional crops raised suffered from drought. I inspected and ordered at once. "Don't

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

collect any double crop charge this year'. This we used to do every year whenever necessary and conditions justify. I made a note of it in my diary when I visited that place. Fortunately, the power is vested in me to grant remission in such cases.

Mr. K. Ayyappan.—May I know whether the Hon'ble Member is going back upon his admission made yesterday that there is a strong case for the abolition of this assessment ?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—There is a good deal of argument to be advanced against the levy of this tax. There are several things to be said against and there are several things to be said in favour of it. I also said that the system was inherited from the time of Lord Corenwallis and Sir Thomas Munroe and it even existed during the time of Akbar. In olden days we had what is called *kala nikuthi*. I only said that the Hon'ble mover had made out an arguable case. The proper stage is when we consider the Settlement Proclamation.

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—On a point of information, Sir. The Hon'ble Member for Revenue said that the main crop charge is collected in Vrischigam.

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—I will have to explain the main system. As you all know paddy cultivation in the Cochin State, we have got three crops. Sometimes they are called Kanni Poovu, Makara Poovu and Meda Poovu or another set of names called Viruppu, Mundakan and Kole-Puncha. Generally the Viruppu crop is harvested in the months of Kanni and some, about 70 or 60 per cent, even in the month of Chingam and in the Chittur Taluk and in some other places in the month of Kanni. Our Kistbandy extends to the three months, Thulam, Vrischigam and Dhanu. The system of collection is different from the system of raising crops. The collection is made in the months of Thulam, Vrischigam and Dhanu. Then there is the Mundakan crop. In most places the Mundakan is treated as a second crop. We have got large extents of land in Mukundapuram and Trichur Taluks and other western parts of the State where the chief crop is Mundakan crop or the Makaram crop. It is known as Thala Mundakan. We have got a laterite tract in the eastern part of Cochin-Kanayannur Taluk. There is the littoral tract and there is also what is called a transitional tract. There it is subject to vicissitudes of season. It is harvested either about the end of Dhanu or the middle of Dhanu or the beginning of Makaram. We collect the tax in respect of those lands in three instalments Makaram, Kumbham and Meenam and in Puncha we collect in Medam and Edavam. The permanent crop is viruppu and the second crop is Mundakan crop. These are lands where two crops are always successfully

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

raised. In such area, the Viruppu is known as the first and Mundakan as the second. There we collect only ¼ in the month of Thulam- Similarly in the case of Mundakan Lands where they raise Puncha crop in three instalments, viz., in the months of Makaram, Kumbham, and Meenam. Kist is collected with reference to the crops recorded during the time of settlement. If it happens to be a Mundakan crop, it is collected in the month of Makaram. If it happens to be Puncha it is collected in the month of Medam.....

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—Taking the case of normal single crop lands on which occasional second crop may be raised when is it that you collect the principal assessment?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—The first crop assessment is collected in the month of Thulam, Vrischigam or Dhanu.

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—Suppose in any plot the first crop is not raised. Will the Government be collecting the main charge in that year ?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—We do collect it.

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—The further question is when the first crop was not raised and the charge was collected, the second crop is raised and information goes to the Government that the main crop was not raised. How is the charge collected?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—In such a case the second crop assessment is not collected. If any demand is made the parties concerned will certainly object to it. It was only this morning that I passed orders in 20 cases that no assessment need be collected.

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—Sir, I am thankful to the Hon'ble the Leader of the House for the compliments he bestowed on the Members on this side of the House, but I am sorry to say that the objection, the Hon'ble Member has raised against the total abolition of the occasional second crop assessment has failed to convince us. I have attempted and with some success, I hope to show that this occasional second crop assessment is unsound in principle in as much as it offends against all principles of ownership and even against the ordinary principles of common tenancy; and that Government in this matter is less magnanimous and more exacting than even the ordinary jenmies. I have also shown that this assessment is inconsistent and illogical in practice and that it discriminates against paddy crops and thereby compels the cultivator to resort to less productive and more mpoverishing crops in preference to more productive and less mpoverishing ones, and is thus highly injurious to the agricul-

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

tural interests of the State. I have shown that it is a never ending vexation to the cultivators, that it opens the road wide to the demoralisation of both the cultivators and the subordinate Revenue Officials; and that in spite of all these, the proceeds obtained by the Government are ridiculously small, being a paltry sum of 5 to 6 thousand rupees a year. In Shakesperian language I would say it is 'much ado about nothing'. The Hon'ble Member for Revenue was kind enough yesterday to admit the justice of the criticisms levelled against the occasional second crop charge, though to-day it would seem he is going slightly back upon his attitude of yesterday.

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—Very same words I used. Absolutely the same words.

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—But he went on to add that such criticisms can be levelled against any point in the Settlement. Now Sir, I would not take such a pessimistic view of the entire Settlement in the Cochin State. In fairness to the illustrious author of this Settlement, I must emphatically declare that it is an admirable piece of work.

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—Very glad to hear.

Mr. Joseph Pettah.—But no human institution is perfect and changes are found to be necessary here and there when we begin to work it actually. The abolition of the second crop assessment is an instance of such a change. Now, the Hon'ble Member for Revenue says that this system has gone on for 27 years without any complaint or without any change. But that, I respectfully submit, does not mean that the agriculturists were not feeling the hardship all that time. It only means that these cultivators were inarticulate and could not put an effective complaint in the matter. With the organisation of the Legislative Council, however, we find that this matter came to engage the attention of the Council more than once; and every time we find that the question was sought to be met with the same objections, as have been put forth by the Hon'ble Member for Revenue to-day.

Again, he says it is only a matter of three more years, and again my reply would be that it would indeed be a poor consolation to the agriculturists for the 27 years of hardship they have suffered to tell them that they will have to suffer the same only for three years more. Again, referring to the charge of curruption made, the Hon'ble Member for Revenue was pleased to say that the subordinate Revenue Officials are neither paragons of virtue nor villains of the first water, but merely ordinary mortals. That is exactly my position also. It is exactly because of the ordinary

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

character of the revenue officers that I wanted that the system should go. The House will bear me out that I never cast any slur on them. I say that the subordinate officers of the Revenue Department are more efficient and of higher average character than similar officers in many other parts of the world. But it is the system that is corruptive. It affords such attractive and unconquerable temptations as even saints would not be proof against; and it corrupts not merely the officials, but the agriculturists as well, and together they fall into the temptation and connive to defraud the Government. Let us, therefore, nock this system on the head and do away with this temptation and save our people and officials from the mire of corruption.

Next we come to the argument that this occasional second crop assessment is part of the Settlement and, could not, therefore, be changed piecemeal. Sir, I am thankful to the Hon'ble Revenue Member in that he has very kindly admitted that we on this side of the House have made out a strong and real case for the abolition of the second crop assessment. His only difficulty seems to be that it is not possible to abolish the system now. It is here that he fails to convince us. I cannot believe that we are so completely helpless in the matter that we could not make such a small change in this Settlement. It is a truism, Sir, that laws and institutions are made for men and not the latter for the former. The shoe is made for the wearer and not the wearer for shoe. If the shoe pinches it has to be repaired. Sir, I am not a lawyer. Nevertheless, I would venture to think that the change contemplated in the resolution would not involve any legal difficulty at all. The Government, or rather His Highness, who issued the Proclamation promulgating this Settlement, can as well effect this small change in it. Even if we view the Settlement as a two-sided contract, there can be no objection at all to one party waiving any claim it has on the other party. Even in solid international treaties that is what we find. Now, the occasional second crop charge is a claim the Government have on the cultivators according to the provisions of the Settlement. I think there can be no objection at all to the Government's waiving this claim. There can be no legal difficulty in the matter.

Sir, in the whole gallaxy of Cochin Service there is no brighter or more lustrous star than the Hon'ble Member for Revenue or rather the Diwan Peishkar. I have the greatest esteem and regard for him. He knows the country and its conditions as no one else does. That such an able and well-informed officer could not help us in this matter, that such a resourceful officer could not find out a solution to this question, is what puzzles me most.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

I have shown that the practice of occasional second crop assessment is highly objectionable and unproductive.— The Hon'ble Member for Revenue, too, has admitted that I have also shown that there can be no practical difficulty to the abolition of this undesirable feature of our Settlement. It is the considered opinion and the earnest entreaty of the accredited representatives of the people on this side of the House that the Government should bestow its careful consideration on this matter and should find its way to remove this undesirable feature from the Settlement immediately. The Hon'ble Member for Revenue has said that the system has worked without any complaint from the ryots for the last 27 years and that no injury is inflicted on them by this system. It may be, Sir, that the system, if worked as it ought to be in strict theory, may not do much injury. But here it is that I have my strongest complaint. The system is so elastic, it is so indefinite, it is so uncertain, that it could not in practice be worked as it ought to be in strict theory. No reliable record is kept as to the lands on which the first crop is raised, and then comes the second crop. I say that it is an open secret,—I am sure the Hon'ble Members will bear me out,—that the system leads to so much of corruption. It cannot be otherwise, for the system from its very nature lends itself to corruption. Therefore, I pray that the Government do sympathetically consider this resolution and be generous enough to abolish this vexatious system. This is also the earnest entreaty of this side of the House; and in order that the Government and the public may realise that it is so, I beg to press the motion to a division.

Resolution put and carried.

Mr. George Chakyamuri.—A poll, Sir.

The House divided—Ayes 18 and Noes 14.

Ayes.	Noes.
1. Mr. K. Ayyappan.	1. Mr. V. K. Aravindaksha Menon.
2. ,, C. Barton Wright.	2. ,, U. Kandar Menon.
3. ,, A. Eachara Menon.	3. ,, K. P. Kannan Nayar.
4. ,, George Chakyamuri.	4. Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.
5. ,, K. G. Nayar.	5. Mr. K. Krishna Pisharodi.
6. ,, E. Ikkanda Warriar.	6. ,, C. J. Mathew.
7. ,, C. Ittaravi Nambudiri.	7. ,, I. N. Menon.
8. ,, Joseph Pettah.	8. ,, T. Narayana Menon.
9. ,, P. S. Kesavan Nambudiri.	9. ,, P. Nilakanta Menon.
10. ,, P. Krishna Menon.	10. Dr. D. Raghavendra Rao.
11. ,, T. K. Nayar.	11. Mr. M. K. Raman.
12. ,, P. Kumaran Ezhuthassan.	12. Rama Varmha Tampuran.
13. ,, K. Mohamed Seethi.	13. Mr. P. V. Raphael.
14. ,, T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.	14. ,, K. P. Vallon.
15. ,, P. Raman Menon.	
16. Dr. K. Sankara Menon.	
17. Mrs. Swaris.	
18. Dr. A. G. Menon.	

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly